

PAGE(1) Case 4:20-cr-00468-RLW Doc. #: 107 Filed: 10/26/22 Page: 1 of 6 PageID #: 329
4.2021-00820 (SAT.) 10/15/22

Dear Your Honor, Judge P. Choan,

THE INCLOSED IS A ^{'COPY'} LETTER WRITTEN  TO
THE HONORABLE, JUDGE R.L. WHITE, SENT TO YOU AS A
MATTER OF COURT RECORD DUE TO THE FACT THAT
THE MAIL AT THIS FACILITY HAS BEEN UNDEPENDABLE
AS OF LATE.

Thank You.

↳ Sincerely,

T. Bowles

T. BOWLES

RECEIVED
OCT 26 2022
BY MAIL

OCT 26 2022

[COPY]

BY MAIL

Dear Your Honor, Judge R.S. WHITE,

Z. BOROWIAK, ATTORNEY, CAME TO TELL ME ON 10-11-2022, ABOUT A, "NOTICE of 404(b)", HEARING ON 10-12-2022; HE ONLY TOLD ME, "NOTICE of 404(b)", AND NOTHING ELSE. HE DID NOT EXPLAIN TO ME THE EXACT DEFINITION of A, "404(b), FORE"; NOR DID I RECEIVE AN EXPLANATION OF ONE IN WRITING PRIOR TO 10-12-2022, BEFORE WALKING INTO YOUR COURTROOM.

ON THE EVENING of 10-11-2022, I LEARNED THE EXACT DEFINITION, AFTER Z. BOROWIAK'S VISIT TO ME.

WHEN I SAW HIM ON 10-12-2022, WHILE WITHIN THE, "BALL PEN", JUST PRIOR TO ENTERING YOUR COURTROOM, I LOOKED HIM IN HIS EYE AND SAID, "WHY DIDN'T YOU GIVE ME THE EXACT DEFINITION of A 404(b) WHEN YOU SAW ME YESTERDAY?"

HE TURNED HIS BACK ON ME AND HURRIED TOWARDS THE DOOR of YOUR COURTROOM. AS HE DID THIS, HE LIED TO ME, (HIS CLIENT), AND SAID, "YES I DID!"

PRIOR TO HIM WALKING THROUGH SAID DOOR I TOLD HIM TO, "OBJECT", TO THIS, "404(b) HEARING", AND ON THIS HE REPLIED, "OK", AND DISAPPEARED.

DURING THE HEARING ON 10-12-22, I DO NOT RECALL IF HE EVER, "OBJECTION", TO THIS OR NOT.

[COPY]

... (PERHAPS THE COURTROOM TRANSCRIPT COULD CLARIFY THIS.)

I WAS INTENDING TO NOT GIVE UP AND "WAIVE" MY 5TH AMENDMENT RIGHTS. AND RETAIN MY RIGHT NOT TO BE COMPELLED TO BE A WITNESS AGAINST MYSELF. THE 5TH IS A IMPORTANT AMENDMENT DEFENDING AGAINST ACTS VERY DIFFERENT IN THE PAST.

SO THAT THEY NOT BECOME TRUELY INOPERABLE TUMOORS THAT SPREAD TO THE FUTURE AND PRESENT. OR RESULT IN OVER-CHARGING / SENTENCING.

FURTHERMORE, I REQUESTED OF Z. BOROWIAK IN THE PAST, THAT HE BE A "MOVANT", IN A, "MOTION IN LIMINE, SEEKING TO EXCLUDE PROSECUTION EVIDENCE." HE HAS ACTED CONFUSED AS TO NOT UNDERSTAND WHAT A "MOVANT", WAS. AS I BEGAN TELLING HIM, HE SUDDENLY HAD AN IDEA.

HE TOLD ME HE COULD DO SO, "WHILE IN COURT." WHEN I BROUGHT THIS UP TO HIM ON 10-12-22, HE ACTED AS IF LATE TO BE IN THE COURTROOM, AND HURRIED. IN ADDITION TO THE GRIEVANCE I MENTIONED IN COURT ON 10-12-22, Z. BOROWIAK CONSISTANTLY GOT MAJOR PREMISES IN MY CASE CONFUSED.

ON 9-13-2022 WHEN I SAW HIM IN PERSON HE ~~████████~~ GOT CT. 1 AND CT. 2 CONFUSED WITH...

[COPY]

...CT. 3 AND CT. 4, HE ERRORED IN STATING THAT, "THE PROSECUTION IS WILLING TO DROP CT. 1 AND CT. 2, FOR A GUILTY PLEA ON CT. 3 AND CT. 4."

I THANK YOU FOR ASKING ME IN YOUR COURT IF I UNDERSTOOD THE DEADLINE DATE OF 10-21-22 FOR THE CURRENT PLEA OFFER, FROM THE PROSECUTION, IN MY CASE.

I RECALL AS ANSWERING, "YES, THAT I BELIEVE IT IS A TACTIC." USED BY PROSECUTORS TO PRODUCE A DEFENDANT INTO MAKING A RASH DECISION THAT MAY EFFECT THE REST OF THEIR LIVES, UNINTELLIGENTLY OR UNKNOWINGLY. AND AS A RESULT THE DEFENDANT MAY DECIDE TO DO SOMETHING NOT IN THEIR BEST INTERESTS. THIS COMPELSION TO ACT MAY RESULT INTO ACTIONS LESS THAN DESIREABLE FOR THE DEFENDANT.

ESPECIALLY IF THE DEFENDANT'S FIRST TEN AMENDMENT RIGHTS, UNDER THE GROUNDS OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION, ARE NOT BEING MET.

I FIRST MET ATTORNEY Z. BOROWIAK ON 4-19-22, WHEN I WAS REMOVED FROM ATTORNEY C.J. BANKS; BANKS INFORMED ME OF THIS RE-ASSIGNMENT ON 4-15-2022. WITH RESPECT TO MR. BANKS' BUSY SCHEDULE, I WAS SATISFIED WITH HIS SERVICE. I DO NOT FAULT MR. BANKS BECAUSE THE INVESTIGATOR'S OFFICE IS BUSY.

[Copy]

SINCE THIS FIRST MEETING WITH Z. BOROWIAK ON 4-19-22, OVER (6) SIX MONTHS AGO, I REQUESTED OF HIM SEVERAL THINGS, DETERMINED TO ASSIST HIM WITH MY CASE.

AMPLE ENOUGH TIME TO COMPLETE THE REQUESTED MOTIONS MEANTIONED EARLIER IN THIS LETTER. AND AS WELL AS TIME TO GET THE BASIC FACTS DOWN, MENTIONED EARLIER IN THIS LETTER, AND AS WELL AS TIME TO GET THE BASIC FACTS DOWN, MEANTIONED EARLIER IN THIS LETTER, AND IN COURT ON 10-12-22. AND WITH CONSIDERATION TOWARDS HIS PERSONAL LIFE, AND OTHER CLIENTS. HIS TIME.

I RECALL ASKING ON 10-12-22, THAT Z. BOROWIAK BE "REMOVED", FROM MY CASE ON THE GROUNDS OF THE, "6TH AMENDMENT of THE U.S. CONSTITUTION", FOR "INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE of COUNSEL."

I KEPT A METICULOUS LIST OF SEVERAL THINGS I SAW, AS THE LIST OF GRIEVANCES IS LONG, BY Z. BOROWIAK, THAT WERE NEGIGENT ON HIS BEHALF AND, OR EVEN DELIBERATE. Thank You again Your Honor for giving Me the opportunity to be heard in Your Courtroom, the opportunity to speak in a Courtroom should NOT be taken for granted by anyone it is bestowed upon.

↳ Sincerely,

T. Bowles
T. Bowles

Tom Bowles, 76421, Pod-C, 3
STE. GENEVIEVE CO. JAIL
5 BASLER DR.
STE. GENEVIEVE, MO. 63670

MAILED FROM
STE GENEVIEVE CO
DETENTION CENTER



(LEGAL MAIL)

RECEIVED

OCT 26 2022

BY MAIL

(LEGAL MAIL)

The Honorable, Judge P. Croan,
SUITE 9N,

T. EAGELTON U.S. COURTHOUSE,
111 S. 10TH ST.
63102-112748
ST. LOUIS, MO. 63102